DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 182 HE 013 674

AUTHOR Pasch, Marvin
TITLE Using the Developer/Demonstrators of the National Diffusion Network to Expand Higher Education's Professional Development Capability.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Philadelphia, PA, March 12-14, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Cooperative Programs; Demonstration Programs; Educational Development; Educational Resources; *Faculty Development; Feasibility Studies; Higher Education; Human Resources; *Improvement Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Needs Assessment; Pilot Projects; Professional Continuing Education; *Professional Development; Questionnaires; Teacher Improvement; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Cleveland State University OH; *National Diffusion Network

ABSTRACT

A feasibility study was conducted to assess the level of interest by the Developer/Demonstrator (D/D) programs of the federally-supported National Diffusion Network in collaborating with Cleveland State University's College of Education in a program of professional development for educators in Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Of the 100 D/D project directors surveyed in 1980, 95 expressed a willingness to participate as a resource for professional development. D/D's were also asked to rate listed strategies upon which a collaboration might be built and to recommend strategies other than those identified in the questionnaire. The highest ratings went to the "expansion of inservice training to fit under the umbrella of a university course." Their responses reveal a concern for needs assessment, expansion of their training to conform to university expectations, and evaluation/followup. Financial support from the university was identified by almost half of the respondents as an incentive for collaboration, followed by academic credit and publicity. In regard to barriers, the financial assistance issue was the first priority concern. It is suggested that future investigation is needed to determine whether parallel interest in collaboration is present in other urban universities in addition to Cleveland State University. Additionally, attention is directed to defining professional development and indicating weakness of inservice education. The role of the urban university in professional development and the contribution that can be made by D/D programs are also addressed. A sample questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200182

USING THE DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATORS OF THE NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK TO EXPAND HIGHER EDUCATION'S PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CAPABILITY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marvin Pasch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper

Delivered at the

Annual Conference

of the

Eastern Educational Research Association

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

March 12-14, 1981

by

Marvin Pasch

Chairperson and Associate Professor

Department of Curriculum and Foundations

Cleveland State University

HE013 624

Using the Developer/Demonstrators of the National Diffusion Network to Expand Higher Education's Professional Development Capability

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to present the findings from a preliminary feasibility study. The study was conceived to learn whether a particular resource - the Developer/Demonstrator programs in the federally supported National Diffusion Network would be attracted by a proposal to collaborate with an urban college of education in a program for teacher professional development. The findings can be generalized to any university environment where teacher professional development is a major audience -- certainly, to other urban situated universities. The study is based on the assumption that the university administration and faculty are supportive of the collaboration. The actual interest level in the community of urban universities is not investigated.

Prior to a discussion of the findings of the study of the Developer/Demonstrator as a resource, some definitional and analytic groundwork is necessary.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INSERVICE EDUCATION

Facing a decline in enrollments, community pressures for quality, accountable schools and limited teacher turnover, LEA administrators and teacher organization representatives are placing increased emphasis on professional development for their teachers. Professional development, as defined in this paper, must possess the following core attributes:

1. Professional development is a response to a clear, substantial and present need of the client teacher group.
2. It contains undergirding principles and/or theory.

3. It is a multi-stage process including:

   a. presentations of appropriate awareness and training information
   b. practice in simulated and classroom settings
   c. supervision after implementation
   d. evaluation and follow-up activities

The need for a concerted emphasis on professional development for teachers is unquestionable. However, an examination of the history of past efforts to stimulate, re-train and renew teachers through professional development is a journey through a graveyard of conceptual fuzziness, unfulfilled promises and missed opportunities. (Allen, 1980; Jones and Hayes, 1980; Joyce and Showers, 1980; and Yarger, 1979). Too few chroniclers have measured their supposed accounts of professional development encounters against a clearly defined set of core attributes. Even fewer have gathered any believable evidence that what was attempted had any appreciable impact on teacher performance, much less student learning. (Nicholson and Joyce, 1977).

The conclusions are hardly surprising since teacher professional development as a concept and a movement has been limited by a failure to separate it from the much maligned practice of inservice education. A recital of the weaknesses of inservice education serves as a reminder of what professional development must avoid. Weaknesses can be found in both planning for inservice and in its delivery system as well. In regard to planning, there is often a lack of participant involvement, (Nicholson and Joyce, 1979) poorly conceived assessment of needs, (Okum, 1980) and vague objectives. Often, the topics selected for inservice activity meet district wide needs that are not shared by individual building faculties or promote philosophical/psychological approaches that are advanced by only a segment of the school community. (Jones and Hayes, 1980,

Graybeal, 1978, Rogus, 1980).

Among the common weaknesses in the delivery system for inservice are an over-reliance on the "one-shot" presentation or workshop, an imbalance of theory and application, uneven quality of the inservice resource, failure to apply the principles of adult learning, and a universal absence of implementation as well as outcome evaluation. (Moburg, 1972)

MOVING TOWARD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE URBAN UNIVERSITY ROLE

If professional teacher development is to achieve a separate identity, three problems must be confronted and solved. The first is the problem of legitimacy and credibility, which necessitates a brokerage role between available resources and client needs. The second problem involves the evaluation role from which a full range of evaluation services is expected. Among these services are needs assessment, implementation and outcome evaluation. Capable people must be available to assist LEA's with evaluation requirements.

Although other organizations; e.g. teacher centers and regional development labs may claim that they can solve these problems, a college of education, especially in an urban area possesses the most attractive mix of legitimacy, credibility and resources. How eagerly urban universities would pursue the roles of broker and evaluator is an open question, although the signs are favorable. Colleges and universities will be hard pressed to maintain enrollments in the coming generation. Given the somber demographic projections, universities have shaken their lethargy and are altering their "Byzantine" rules and procedures to respond to emergent school needs.

Dwight Allen (1980) provides a second rationale for cooperation.

> "Societal dissatisfaction with education, at both secondary and tertiary levels has created a new albeit negative incentive for these institutions to cooperate. All social institutions are under scrutiny and attack as antagonists seek out their weaknesses. It behooves all educational institutions to band together. . ."(p.1)

In any event, the major thrust of this paper is toward the third problem, namely, the identification of quality resources whose delivery system is consistent with the attributes of professional development.

MOVING TOWARD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE D/D's OF THE NDN AS RESOURCES

The one hundred and forty programs currently receiving dissemination funds in the federally financed National Diffusion Network are a prime resource for teacher professional development. The programs represent a variety of philosophical and psychological perspectives and exist in many different content areas.

NDN projects available for adoption

Content Area			Content Area		
Basic Skills	32%	45 programs	Career/Vocational Education	6%	9 programs
Early Childhood/Parent Readiness	20%	27 programs	Preservice/Inservice	6%	9 programs
Special Education	9%	12 programs	Bilingual/Migrant	4%	5 programs
Gifted and Talented, Health, Human Behavior, Physical Education	9%	12 programs	Alternative Schools/ Programs	3%	4 programs
Environmental Education/ Science/Social Science	7%	10 programs	Adult Education	2%	3 programs
			Organization/Administration	1%	2 programs
			Arts/Communication/ Technology	1%	2 programs

---

[1]For a description of all Developer/Demonstrator programs, consult EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT WORK, Seventh Edition, Fall, 1980. A publication of the U.S. Department of Education available through the Order Department, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom St., San Francisco, CA 94103

The Developer/Demonstrator programs are in the business of promoting and disseminating a particular educational change. Consequently, each D/D is thoroughly familiar with his/her program, often having participated in its design and development. Typically, the D/D program began as a practical application of a philosophical or psychological theory or set of principles. Each D/D program works to improve the match between the educational need it addresses and its curriculum response.

To increase the chances that a D/D program will meet the needs of the prospective user, programs are required to inform potential adopters what responsibilities the D/D assumes as well as those assumed by the LEA before an adoption can be consummated. Local education agencies who adopt programs receive inservice training for those staff members expected to implement the program. Furthermore, each D/D program has been subjected to a rigorous evaluation by the federal Joint Diffusion Review Panel (JDRP). In order to be validated and gain entrance into the NDN, programs must demonstrate statistically and educationally significant results and the potential to be adopted in other locations with comparable results. Finally, the process of dissemination which requires a formal adoption, guarantees that each stage of the professional development process is addressed, from awareness through evaluation and follow-up.

USING THE D/D's AS A RESOURCE: A PRELIMINARY FEASIBILITY STUDY

I. Purposes, Data Source, and Method

The chief purpose of the feasibility study was to assess the level of interest by D/D's in collaborating with the College of Education, Cleveland State University in a program of professional development for educators in

Cuyahoga County, Ohio. During the Summer of 1980, questionnaires were mailed to the 140 D/D project directors. One hundred (100) responses were returned (71% of the population). In addition to establishing a level of interest, D/D's were also asked to rate listed strategies upon which a collaboration might be built and to recommend strategies other than those identified in the questionnaire. Finally, the respondents identified incentives and barriers that the university might create that would accelerate or retard the growth and richness of the collaboration.

II. Findings

The questionnaire together with a compilation of responses can be examined in the Appendix. In respect to the major purpose, ninety-five (95) respondents expressed a willingness to participate as a resource for professional development. In respect to the strategies for collaboration, the highest ratings went to the "expansion of inservice training to fit under the umbrella of a university course." Following close behind were "offering credit for typical training sessions" (generally 2-5 days), for "completing evaluation requirements during implementation" and for "training university personnel and utilizing them as turnkey (certified) trainers." Interestingly, Lee Wickline, Director of the NDN, reported in the NDN Reporter (March, 1979) that for the NDN to grow, "We must train certified trainers in universities to relieve some of the load and stress now being placed on D/D projects when funding for demonstration terminates."

The respondents also suggested additional strategies or variants of listed strategies. The most frequently mentioned suggestions were: (numbers indicate frequency)

- Special interest workshops for related D/D clusters (10)
- Sponsor awareness presentations but not for credit (9)

- Assist implementation at an adopter site (9)
  - Monitor implementation
  - Conduct outcome evaluation studies
- Incorporate NDN programs into existing courses to serve as reality applications of theory (9)
- Offer credit for an expanded three day training package plus the teacher's implementation of the program (9)

Beyond the obvious conclusion that D/D's are interested in the proposed collaboration, their responses in respect to strategies reveal a concern for needs assessment, expansion of their training to conform to university expectations, evaluation and follow-up. Consequently, the responses give greater weight to an argument that the D/D's comprise a quality resource for professional development.

Moving on to suggested "Incentives" and "Barriers" created by the University, the most frequently mentioned contributions are presented below. (numbers indicate frequency)

Incentives	Barriers
(44) Financial support (travel, per diem, materials)	(55) Lack of financial assistance
(19) Academic credit	(34) Time constraints
(18) Publicity for project	(12) Scheduling difficulties

As can be seen from examination of the list of "Incentives" generated by D/D respondents, "FINANCIAL SUPPORT" from the university was identified by almost half of the respondents with "ACADEMIC CREDIT" and "PUBLICITY", a distant second and third, respectively. From a university perspective, the three responses are interrelated. Financial support of both institutional fixed costs and instructional resources are supported by student credit hours and universities have learned the value of publicity if it is timely and reaches an appropriate audience.

At Cleveland State University, one particular strategy which packages outside resources successfully, has been to initiate a unique special topics course for one quarter hour graduate credit scheduled during a single weekend. Consequently, the D/D's travel costs, living costs and part time faculty salary can be limited to a practical total amount. At CSU, the College of Education has created four curriculum and service units -- "The Center for the Study of Individual Differences", the "Center for Productive School and Classroom Discipline", the "Multi-Cultural Education Center" and a general service center for counseling and basic skills improvement. Under the sponsorship of these centers and the University College of Continuing Education, D/D projects can be brought to Cleveland. The single credit, one weekend pattern provides a relatively low cost/low risk test of the efficacy of the topic and the outside resource. If the test is successful, then multi-credit experiences can be planned. If the test proves to be unsuccessful, then not much is lost. Given the proven record of successful training by D/D project personnel, few tests of collaboration will be abject failures.

In regard to "Barriers" mentioned by the respondents, the "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE" issue is again the first priority concern. The "TIME CONSTRAINTS" and "SCHEDULING DIFFICULTY" problem would be reduced by the aforementioned weekend scheduling pattern. All scheduling preference assessments of CSU faculty and students reveal that weekend experiences are highly attractive options. Weekends would also be attractive to D/D personnel since they would be able to schedule themselves to be in the vicinity of the urban area either prior to the weekend or after it. Furthermore, they would be free of any role conflicts since they would be working as university instructors on the weekends.

III. Conclusions and Further Study

The importance of professional teacher development is obvious. If urban colleges of education are to play a substantial role in it they must learn to secure, manage and support outside resources. They must adapt to a new role involving the facilitation of needs and resources rather than, as in the past, the direct provision of resources. Although this analysis of a urban university/D/D collaboration leads one to view the possibilities with optimism, experience suggests that pitfalls remain. University faculty are jealous of their status and prerogatives. To avoid blockages, the case for the D/D program must be carefully prepared and presented in a traditional format. Furthermore, the growth of the collaboration has to be carefully controlled to prevent charges of "empire building." Finally, university faculty must be encouraged to become advocates of resources in their specialty areas. In that way, linkages which promote the collaboration will grow in numbers and in strength.

Future investigation is needed to determine whether parallel interest in collaboration is, indeed, present in other urban universities in addition to Cleveland State University. As stated earlier, the signs are favorable. In the responses of the D/D questionnaire were unsolicited testimonials from sixteen projects reporting that they have participated with universities in collaborative projects. One D/D has been so successful that a college has made participation in D/D training a mandatory class for their pre-service teachers of the severely handicapped. Furthermore, the NDN service units have plans to establish a national committee to explore ways that institutions of higher education can be brought into the NDN as participating organizations.

Without doubt the single most impressive pilot study of the collaborative concept is being tested in Illinois. Under the aegis of the State of Illinois Department of Education, two NDN projects and three Illinois Title IV-C vali-

dated projects are collaborating with six universities to train university staff members as certified trainers and to assist LEA's in each university service areas to adopt the five programs. The expected product from this activity is a "Resource Linkage Model" which can be used by other projects of collaboration. (Werner, 1980)

The "Resource Linkage Model" can be used as a concrete example of collaboration. It can be used to assess higher education's interest in collaboration by replicating the questionnaire study using urban universities as the surveyed population. Because of the urban university's close proximity to large numbers of teachers, professional development should offer a special attraction. It will be interesting to discover how intense the attraction actually is and what incentives and barriers are perceived to exist.

REFERENCES

Allen, D.W. "Merging Resources of the IHE and the LEA for the Improvement of Inter-Institutional Programs." Inservice Centerfold. National Council of States on Inservice Education, April, 1980.

Educational Ideas That Work. Seventh Edition, Fall, 1980 A publication of the U.S. Department of Education. Available from Order Department Far West Regional Laboratory, San Francisco, California.

Graybeal, W.S. In-service Education Alert. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1978.

Jones, L.L., and Hayes, A.E. "How Valid are Surveys of Teacher Needs?" Educational Leadership. 37: 390-392. February, 1980.

Joyce, B.R., and Showers, B. "Improving Inservice Training: The Message of Research." Educational Leadership. 37: 379-385. February, 1980.

Moburg, L.G. Inservice Teacher Training in Reading. Newark, Del.: The International Reading Association, 1972.

Nicholson, A.M., and Joyce, B.R., The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education: An Analytic Review. Syracuse, N.Y.: National Council of States on Inservice Education, 1977.

NDN Reporter, March, 1979.

Okun, K.A., Continuing Education for Education Professionals. Unpublished Paper. University of Michigan, August, 1980.

Rogus, J.F., Making Staff Development and In-Service Programs Were: A Handbook for Local District Planning. Unpublished Report. Cleveland State University, September, 1980.

Werner, L., In-Service Resource Model of Linkage. Unpublished Grant Proposal. State of Illinois Title IV-C, 1980.

Yarger, S.J., "About the Naming of an Orphan - A Letter to a Friend." Journal of Teacher Education. 30: 10. January-February, 1979.

APPENDIX

National Diffusion Network

Developer/Demonstrator Survey

Compilation of 100 Responses

National Diffusion Network Developer/Demonstrator Survey

It's likely that Cleveland State University will receive a significant foundation grant to support the staff development needs of the school districts in Cuyahoga County. (Northeast Ohio) Cleveland State University is a state supported, public institution serving 17,000 undergraduate and graduate students. Among the 32 school districts in its immediate locale is the City of Cleveland with 80,000 pupils, other medium-size cities, suburban communities and rural villages.

Obviously, a College of Education, composed of only 50 faculty members cannot respond to many requests for staff development. However, if the College can contact and contract for outside resources, its reach can be greatly expanded. It is for this purpose that the survey was designed.

Marvin Pasch
Evaluator, D/D Project
"The New Model Me" and Chairperson
of the Department of Curriculum
and Foundations at C.S.U.

---

1. Are there desirable, practical strategies which would enable Cleveland State University to utilize the expertise of the D/D's in the NDN.

   Yes 99

   No 1

   Comments:

---

2. Please evaluate the following strategies by circling the number which corresponds to your judgement about the desirability/practicality of the strategy?

(OVER)

MEAN	Offering university credit for:					
2.0	a. Awareness presentations	low 1	2	3	4	high 5
4.2	b. Typical training sessions	low 1	2	3	4	high 5
4.4	c. An expanded training session which is equivalent to a university course in respect to contact time and completion of assignments	low 1	2	3	4	high 5
3.8	d. Completing evaluation requirements during implementation	low 1	2	3	4	high 5
3.8	e. Training university personnel and utilizing them as turnkey trainers	low 1	2	3	4	high 5

---

3. Please provide me with additional desirable/practical strategies.

10	Offer special interest workshops for related clusters of D/Ds
9	Sponsor awareness sessions but not for credit
9	Facilitate implementation at an adopting site - - monitoring - follow up - evaluation
9	Incorporate NDN programs into appropriate courses to serve as practical applications of theories
9	Offer credit for an expanded three day training plus the teacher's implementation of the program
4	Establish a demonstration site
3	Utilize videotaped D/D presentations
3	On site visits to D/Ds by the university staff
3	Establish a demonstration classroom in a campus setting

4. Would you be willing to participate as a resource to C.S.U. in implementing one or more of these strategies

95 Yes
4 No
1 No response

If yes, please provide:

Project Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Telephone Number: _____

Contact Person: _____

5. What incentives can C.S.U. provide to encourage participation? What barriers might limit D/D participation?

	Incentives		Barriers
44	Financial support (travel, per diem, materials)	55	Lack of financial assistance
19	Academic credit	34	Time constraints
18	Publicity for project (exposure potential adoptors)	12	Scheduling difficulties
10	Consultant stipend	7	Inappropriate or too heterogeneous audience
8	Commitment to assist in monitoring	6	Travel time
8	Opportunity to share expertise	5	Staff shortages
8	Courses scheduled at convenient times for D/Ds	4	Prejudice against university involvement
6	Official adoptions	3	Taking teachers out of the classroom
6	Commitment to assist in evaluation	3	Educators who do not understand their commitment to the adoption process
6	Commitment to assist in follow up	2	Concentration in one area
5	Honoraria	2	University requirements about time frames and credit
5	Commitment to obtain adoptions	2	Not all project training lends itself to course credit
3	Commitment to assist adopting agencies in obtaining funding		
2	Formation of a sub-network of D/D		

Thank you for your time and attention. Please insert the survey into the postage free envelope and mail. I will compile the data and report back to all D/D's that respond by September 1, 1980.

Marvin Pasch
University Tower 1448
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115